

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 23, 2004. Claims 10-26, 28-40, 50-66, 68-80, 84-86, 90-92, and 94-96 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9, 41-49, 81-83, 87-89, and 93 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 95 and 96 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 10, 20, 50, 60, and 94 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 10, 20, 50, 60, and 94 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 16-24, 26, 28-31, 37-44, 46, 48-50, 56-64, 66, 68-71, and 77-94 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,968 (Shirai et al.) and U.S. Patent No 6,327,610 (Uchida et al.); and rejected Claims 5, 11-15, 25, 32-36, 45, 52-55, 65, and 72-76 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirai and Uchida, as applied to Claims 1, 10, 20, 41, 50 and 60 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,800 (Holtz). Cancellation of Claims 1-9, 41-49, 81-83, 87-89, and 93 renders their rejections moot. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of the other claims.

Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 10, 20, 50, 60, and 94, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the proposed combination of the cited prior art at least for the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 10 is an information processing apparatus with a function of receiving electronic mail. The apparatus includes an

extraction means for extracting access information contained in electronic mail that has been received. The access information includes limitation of access to an object, an object ID for specifying the object, the object ID including at least some information that is not an object name and path, and access permission information for permitting a user to access the object regardless of whether or not the user is registered to access storage means in which the object is stored. The apparatus also includes an access means for accessing the object using the object ID and the access permission information under the limitation specified by the access information extracted by the extraction means, and a display means for presenting a display that corresponds to the object based upon a content of the object accessed by the access means.

Among other important features of Claim 10 is that the information processing apparatus accesses an object using object ID that includes at least some information that is not an object name and file path. For example, as shown in Figure 5, an access key includes a document ID, and a document is accessed based on the access key. Support in the specification for this feature can be found at least at page 13, lines 11-13; page 17, lines 6 and 7; and from page 19, line 25, to page 20, line 2. In an information processing apparatus having this feature along with the other features recited in Claim 10, even if a user changes its object name and/or storage location (file path), a receiver can correctly access the object.

Shirai et al. relates to an information processing system capable of file transmission and an information processing apparatus in the system. That patent has been adequately discussed in previous papers and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Uchida et al., as understood by Applicant, relates to a system for broadcasting electronic

mails that separately stores and sends a portion of electronic mails with an access code for a filtering and retrieving purpose. The Office Action states at page 5 that the proposed combination of Shirai and Uchida et al. discloses "... an extraction step of extracting the access information contained in electronic mail that has been received (Shirai, Col. 14, lines 50-51); an object access step of accessing an object based upon the access information extracted at said extraction step (Shirai, Col. 14, lines 52 and 53); and a display step of presenting a display that corresponds to the object based upon a content of the object accessed at said access step (Shirai, Col. 15, lines 40-45)." Applicant submits that these nothing in these sections would teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that accesses an object using object ID that includes at least some information that is not an object name and file path, as recited in Claim 10. In addition, Applicant notes that in Shirai et al., Figure 4B shows an attached file (reference numeral 406), which describes the location of the file indicated by the computer name and the path name in the computer. However, Applicant submits that nothing in Figure 4B, or any other section of the specification, would teach or suggest accessing an object by using object ID that includes at least some information that is not an object name and file path, as recited in Claim 10. Furthermore, in regard to Uchida et al., nothing was cited in the Office Action, and Applicant has not found anything in the specification, that would teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that accesses an object using object ID that includes at least some information that is not an object name and file path, as recited in Claim 10.

Independent Claims 20, 50, 60, and 94 include the same feature of accessing an object using object ID that includes at least some information that is not an object name and file

A review of the other art of record, including Holtz, has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as applied against the independent claims herein. Therefore, those claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application (including new Claims 95 and 96) depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

ZLP. Dianna
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,256

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 418420v1